UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Duty to Civilization

By FRANCIS NEILSON

If the Sermon On the Mount Were Preached Today—

By V. T. POMEROY

The American Commission's Report On Ireland

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 7

Chicago, April 14, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

AND

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—
Notes.—J. H. H. 99
Duty to Civilization.—Francis Neilson 101

THE PULPIT—
If the Sermon on the Mount Were Preached Today.—*Rev. V. T. Pomeroy* 104

CONTRIBUTED—
A Community Church and Freedom.—A. W. Whitney . . 107
The American Commission's Report on Ireland.—John Haynes Holmes 109

SELECTED—
Militarism and the Masses.—*Philadelphia Evening Ledger* 110

POETRY—
Pharisee and Publican.—R. W. Hogue 99
Youth, the Builder.—*Ruth Pearson* 104
George Nasmyth.—*Brent Dow Allinson* 107
"At" or "Through"?—*C. H. Morgan* 107
Night.—Edward H. Dewey 109

THE FIELD—
Community Church Conference 111
Chicago Church Federation Endorses Movement for Naval Holiday 111
A Friendly World.—*The Friends' Intelligencer* 111

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

Vol. LXXXVII THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1921 Number 7

PHARISEE AND PUBLICAN.

I.

O God, how we gloried in our sin
  Of carnage and hatred and pride!
How we preached it forth in crimson texts!
  How we lied, O God, how we lied!
For we stripped the Christ of the garb of love
  And bedecked Him in armored mail;
And we clenched His outstretched hand on the sword,
  As we bade Him shout and rail.
We named Him Lord of Munition Plants,
  Then we drafted the Christ, and worse—
While we pledged our future love to Him
  When the blast of His breath's strong curse
Should still the shouts of His barbarous foes
  On whom, in our Pharisee's pride,
We lay all the guileful guilt, all the crimes—
  Of the Hell where the Millions died.

II.

We have scrapped the Sermon on the Mount,
  Gone back to "an eye for an eye
And a tooth for a tooth," of what avail
  Is Good Will for a battle cry?
With the torture of gas and liquid fire
  And the murderous, cold blockade
We beat the Devil at his own game,
  As we hated, and killed—and prayed!
We said the things 'twas safe to repeat,
  In Thine hour of trial we failed,
And those who stood for the Better Way
  We threatened, arrested and jailed!
We have censored Fact and shackled Thought,
  Bade Conscience be silent and wait,
While Prophets of God, withholding His Truth,
  Placed their souls in charge of the State.

Be Thou merciful unto us, O God!
  Unto us who know that we lied!
Let the Publican's cry and the contrite heart
  Take the place of the Pharisee's pride.

R. W. Hogue.

We are wondering if it is utterly impossible to be strenuously faithful to one's convictions, to speak them forth without equivocation or evasion, and escape the charge of intolerance. Again and again we get discouraged in this matter. We care tremendously about certain ideas and ideals, and feel that it is our duty to advocate them with all the power of mind and spirit that we can marshal. We feel also that, just to the extent our beliefs are worth anything, we are obligated to attack as though we meant business, those opinions which seem to be untrue and evil. Such action on our part, however, brings down constantly upon our poor head the charge of being conceited, self-seeking, arrogant, intolerant, and a traitor to all ideals of brotherhood and love. We have no doubt that these indictments are in some measure true, for we realize that frequently we fail to live up to the standards toward which we aim. On the other hand, however, we are impressed by the fact that often we are charged with sin for no other reason than that we are trying to "fight the good fight" for a faith which our critics do not like. We are guilty not of manifesting a bad spirit but of advocating a wrong opinion. It is our critic who is guilty of arrogance, intolerance, and all the rest, since he is unwilling that we shall hold, and advocate to the utmost of our ability, ideas and ideals contrary to his own. For ourselves, we have never seen anything essentially inconsistent between ardent advocacy of opinion and ardent good-will toward men. It has always seemed possible to us to hate the sin, while loving the sinner. At any rate, we are not going to abate one jot or tittle our love of what we hold good and our hate of what we hold evil, just because somebody who does not like our ideas, thinks us impudent. We never expect to see that day when there are not some people around who deem it an impertinence to disagree with them!

Now that we are philosophizing a bit, we would make confession of another problem that is constantly bothering us. Why is it that so many persons are sensitive to criticism, or even a simple statement of adverse opinion? Why is a frank defense of your own beliefs in contradistinction to the beliefs of somebody else, regarded so frequently by this somebody else as a personal offence to be resented to the uttermost? We think that we have suffered our full share of attack and denunciation. We should be hard put to it to find an epithet which has not been hurled at us, or a slander which has not been charged against us, by opponents. But we cannot recall ever having borne a grudge against anybody for these assaults, or regarded them as anything more than a part of the order of the day. We have taken it for granted that our opponent believed something as earnestly as we believed the opposite, and was exercising his perfectly proper privilege of trying to destroy what he sincerely regarded as false and dangerous. Why should we object to such laudable service of truth, just because we happened to be in the line of fire? We know too few persons, however, who seem to feel about this thing as we do. At any rate, we constantly have the experience of finding people wildly excited, bitterly resentful, grievously offended, for no other reason, so far as we can discover, than the fact that we have stood up in our boots, and ventured the emphatic opinion that this thing, which we believed, was right, and this other thing, which they believed, was wrong? Are these people so impeccable that

they cannot endure the suggestion that they may not have all the truth? Are they so infallible that their opinions cannot be questioned, or even discussed? Are they so tender that they must be granted protection from the rough give-and-take of the battle of life? We do not know. We simply record our conviction that the habit of interpreting controversial opinion in terms of personal grievance is a form of childishness, of which any grown man or woman should be ashamed.

Whither are we tending? Mr. Wells, one of the most acute of all contemporary observers, seems to be growing pessimistic. In the closing chapters of his "The Outline of History," which must have been written about a year ago, he looked bravely into the future and dared to forecast "the next step in history" as "a unification of the world into one community of knowledge and will." In his "Russia in the Shadows," written after his return from Petrograd and Moscow in September, 1920, there was indicated a distinct loss of confidence in the future. He had suddenly been brought face to face with "the final collapse of all that remains of modern civilization throughout all that was formerly the Russian empire"; and this spectacle seems to have persuaded him that "it is highly improbable that the collapse will be limited to its (the Russian) boundaries." In his most recent utterance, a remarkable article in the March 26th issue of *The Saturday Evening Post,* he strikes a still deeper and fuller note of pessimism. He declares that he has "written this article several times," in order that it may involve no exaggerations and may present his thoughts with the greatest possible degree of accuracy. Then he writes this terrific sentence as his summary of the present situation of the world: "I want to say that this civilization in which we are living is tumbling down, and I think, tumbling down very fast; that I think rapid, enormous efforts will be needed to save it; and that I see no such efforts being made at the present time." We are ourselves constitutionally optimistic, and therefore still find it difficult to believe that the modern world is actually heading back into disintegration and decay. We see no use, however, in avoiding facts and thus deliberately deceiving ourselves. Certainly it is true that, at the best, we are confronted by a stupendous task of social reconstruction, and that this task can be accomplished only by enormous labor and sacrifice upon the part of all men everywhere. To realize that we are on the verge of ruin, and that nothing can save us but our own efforts, is perhaps our best guarantee that prophecies of doom are false.

We pick up our newspaper each morning with eager curiosity to discover what Germany has been forced to do in the matter of making reparation to the Allies. We thought that the French, English and Belgian troops had been sent into German territory for the purpose of providing that the reparation policy agreed upon by Lloyd George and Briand should be carried out to the letter and on the minute. Day after day, indeed, week after week, has passed, however, and nothing seems to happen. Meanwhile the enormous expense charges incident to the occupation are rolling up, to be paid some day and somehow by the already overburdened taxpayers of England and France. Unless something happens very soon, we shall be confirmed in our judgment that force is the one weapon which is absolutely ineffective for any purpose when those against whom it is directed refuse to recognize it. We feel sure that there are ways of getting the Germans to pay such share, at least, of the reparation demanded as all right minded men everywhere recognize to be just and fair. Those ways do not include, however, the way of the sword. The Allies may push their present policy to the very limit of severity. They may occupy the whole of Germany from west to east, and north to south. They may plant their troops and machine guns in every city, may occupy every public building, determine every item of public policy; but they cannot get money unless the Germans have it to pay and are willing to pay it when they have it. This is elementary, but even so it is too much to expect that the war-crazed and booty-fattened militarists of London and Paris will ever learn it.

Few persons interested in the world of learning could have read of the landing of Professor Einstein on our shores without a conscious thrill of expectancy. We felt exactly as we did in 1912, when Henri Bergson made his first visit to this country. Then it was the epoch-making philosopher of his time—now it is the epoch-making scientist! For while there may be few who understand the meaning of Einstein theories of relativity, and none who can estimate with finality their real significance, all must agree that they mark a crisis in the world's thought which may be more, but can hardly be less, important than that which attaches itself to the work and fame of Newton. We confess, even in the old-age of our youth, to being much of a hero-worshipper. It stirs us, therefore, to think that we walk the streets of the same city with such a man, and may also, as in the case of Bergson, hear him expound his doctrines. And still more does it stir us to think that, in such an age of worldly strife as this, there should arise such a genius to open the doors that lead to that vast realm of thought which is forever "above the battle" which besets us poor denizens of earth. How petty seem our prejudices and hates, our wars and pogroms, as we look upon this Teuton Jew, and study the work which he is doing for mankind!

It has been pleasant to read the generous tributes paid to the memory of the late John Burroughs. For a few blessed hours the hatred in human hearts seemed to disappear and all men to be made kin again by the influence of one loving soul. His was a noble life, lived in the presence and the adoration of Nature, and in gracious sympathy with men. Burroughs was something of a scientist, though not in the creative sense of Gray and Wallace, or even of his comrade, John Muir. He was much of a philosopher, though not in the same class with Humboldt or Emerson. His approach to the world, after all, was not so much an intellectual as an emotional approach. It was his heart and not his head that led him, and thus made him an interpreter of Nature in the poetic rather than the scientific or philosophic sense. It is this which gives Burroughs his high rank in the field of literature, for certainly he must ever be ranked with Henry David Thoreau as the consummate artist of the fields and woods. And there was a normal human side to Burroughs which Thoreau never had, and which made him, even while a hermit in his beloved Catskills, a gracious companion of mankind. Best of all, his life was simple, pure, serene. The dignity of the hills was in him, and the beauty of the midnight stars. Few men in his day were so beloved, and none bequeathed to the memory of future generations a more blessed benediction of years well spent. In the contemplation of such a life, how easy seems our earthly task—and yet how few achieve it!

There are five churches here—Methodist, Christian (Disciples), Baptist, Episcopal and Catholic. In all but the latter, the minister is preaching to empty pews, as their respective congregations number very few in comparison to the total population, which numbers about 1,500 souls.

This quotation is from a personal letter, received from a friend in a town in the state of California. It describes a situation typical of American Protestantism in all parts of the country. Imagine *five* churches in a community which has within its borders only fifteen hundred men, women and children! If Christians were really Christians, there would of course be only *one* church in the town. Even then, it would not take an exceptionally large edifice to house every inhabitant of the town on a Sunday morning. As it is, with Protestants and Catholics still finding it difficult to worship and work together, this community should have not more than two churches; the Protestants might have a modicum of the sense of the Catholics in binding their people together into a single fellowship! But we have no doubt that, in places like this, bad matters must get worse, before the community church movement can win recognition. And fortunately they are getting worse every hour. In spite of the blustering of denominational officials, and the camouflage of ecclesiastical statisticians, Protestantism is perishing, and must soon give way to something that is really vital.

To all of our readers we say, Read "The Ways of the Gods," by Algernon Sidney Crapsey! We shall review the book at length in due season. Meanwhile we have read enough of it to be persuaded, quite apart from all question of agreement in matters of opinion, that this volume represents one of the important publications of the day. Its thesis is revolutionary. As presented by the author in his Proem, it involves the conclusion that there is "a necessary relation between the life of a god and the life of his people." To quote an important passage,

The god of a given people is the embodiment of the economic conditions of that people, and the economic conditions determine the social and political institutions of a people. Hence it is that under certain economic conditions, with their attendant social and political institutions, a given god has sway over the religious life of a people. When these economic conditions change, this god disappears, and a new god takes his place. . . . Their going and coming (are) determined by the industrial development of the people and the consequent changes in social and political organization.

This seems to be a rigorous application to the problem of religion of the familiar doctrine of economic determinism. It is worked out by Dr. Crapsey in much detail, through a series of chapters in which the deities of Greece, Rome, Israel, and Christianity in all its stages of development down to modern times, are discussed. The book is a terrific challenge to the religious knowledge and ideals of the modern world. It should be not only "tasted" and "swallowed," but "chewed and digested," to quote the familiar Baconian phrases, by every open-minded man.

Duty to Civilization

"I received your letter in regard to the endowment fund for UNITY. You could hardly expect me to contribute to such a fund as long as UNITY devotes itself as tirelessly as it has done of late to apologizing for Germany, discrediting Great Britain and identifying free speech with attacks upon people who believe that duty to civilization demanded the defeat of German arms.

"Nevertheless I think that even views which I detest ought to have free expression and so I am sending my subscription to UNITY for the current year."

The quotation is taken from a letter received by a member of the Unity Endowment Fund Committee, which comes from an American leader of thought, a man of high integrity, one who holds a distinguished position in the sphere of intellectual achievement. He is broad enough in his Liberalism to read views he detests, tolerant to the point of subscribing to a paper which contains articles he dislikes. Such a critic is rare in these days; but, refreshing as it is to meet such a man, the charges he brings against UNITY must be answered, for they are serious.

In the first place let me repudiate all three allegations contained in this letter, and then proceed to examine each one separately. As I am responsible

for most of the editorials dealing with foreign affairs I consider that my facts are challenged by the writer of the letter, that he accuses me of showing bias in my treatment of European affairs. Taking up the first allegation, "apologizing for Germany," I am puzzled to know what is meant by this charge. No apology has ever come from me, not for the old government or the new, not for the old rulers or for their diplomatists. I know not any statesman, monarchial or republican, in Europe who has my sympathy; and, for the past twenty-five years, I have been remarkably consistent in my impartiality in this matter: I have not found but one, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who was worth saying a good word for. As for European governments it is not likely that I, knowing their secret policies so well, should apologize for anything they have done.

My record is perfectly clear and regular. When Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the maker of the Boer War, and Britain's most unscrupulous imperialist, began his campaign in 1903 to convert the British masses to Colonial Preference (protective duties), I was the first candidate in the constituencies to raise my voice against the scheme because it was "German." Mr. Chamberlain said: "Germany is so satisfactory a place to live in for its inhabitants and for its working class people that less and less are they leaving it even for America, Canada, or any of our great Colonies." This from the British statesman who advocated the famous Anglo-Saxon Alliance: Great Britain, Germany and the United States of America. Every bureaucratic measure taken from Imperial Germany by British statesmen met with my opposition. To my mind protection and militarism have always gone hand in hand: France, Russia and Germany, in this respect, were always anathema to every liberal-minded Englishman. The great Lord Salisbury himself was in agreement with his political opponents on this matter. He said: "The real cause of the increase of protective duties is the establishment of those gigantic military forces which constitute a permanent drain on the resources of industry, a permanent danger to the interests of commerce." For ten years I wrote, week in and week out, against German, French and Russian militarism, because it was speedily militarizing England. In 1909 I said the cost of military expenditure of the powers would lead to war; then the active partners to the two military groups on the Continent spent the following enormous sums: France and Russia, £82,411,963, and Germany and Austria, £54,562,094. In that year Great Britain spent £27,760,00 on her army.

There was nothing in the form of the government of Imperial Germany that I favored, and there is nothing in the form of the government of Socialist Germany that I approve of. Administratively there is little to choose between them. How then the writer of the letter has been able to construe any statement of mine as an apology for Germany is a mystery to me. Now I should like to be perfectly frank about this and ask: Where were all the devout Americans, who, since 1914 or 1917, sought the overthrow of German arms, when the British radicals were fighting militarism and navalism in every shape and form? What were they doing to help to destroy militarism when Britain crushed the Boer Republics, when France bombarded Casablanca, when Italy went into Tripoli? I do not remember a single American leader of thought raising his voice in behalf of the efforts British radicals put forth since 1904 against secret diplomacy and militarism. Most of the indignation here against "German arms" is of recent growth; it took root sometime between August 4th, 1914, and the end of April, 1917. For at least ten years before Russia invaded Germany and Germany invaded Belgium the small group of British radicals, of which I was a member, fought alone the battle against secret diplomacy, militarism, and the German theory of the State. We saw our government adopting every German bureaucratic device, going to work sedulously to Prussianize England, and we knew, indeed we said, our rulers would try to put us in Prussian chains as soon as war broke out. It seems to me rather late in the day for anyone here to get indignant about a system which afflicted the whole of Europe for so long. When I revert to the works, written prior to the outbreak of the war, by European and American authors on Imperial Germany, and read their fulsome encomiums lavished on her military and civil efficiency, I feel a kind of contempt for that class of scribe that can unsay his say so easily. The opinion of British radicals, on the other hand, never changed; what they were before the war, they were during it, and remain the same.

What then can be meant by the phrase "apologizing for Germany" when it is flung at a British radical? Why this and this only: that the radical will not agree with those whose reason has been deceived and debauched by allied war propagandists. What else can it mean? If the phrase have reference to German militarism, I should like to know why any industrious American citizen wastes his time worrying about that which no longer exists, and does not use his intellectual energy denouncing French militarism and British militarism; or is it to be imagined that these are beneficent systems devoted to the spread of Christian doctrine and essential to the maintenance of civilization? Surely militarism is militarism, no matter by whom it be practiced. To illustrate the extraordinary situation created in Europe by military alliances before the war began, permit me to quote from a French work as well-known to European militarists as Bernhardi's work was to British and American civilians? Colonel Arthur Boucher was the most popular military writer in France. Early in 1914 he pub-

lished "L'Allemagne en Péril." He dreaded the future and hoped for a triple alliance, France, Russia and Germany, "forming a group so strong that no country, no coalition, could think of struggling against it," but so long as Germany held Alsace-Lorraine, France was "unalterably determined to wrest the people of these provinces from the yoke of their invaders and to see the French flag floating once more from the summit of their public buildings." He appreciated the geographical position of Germany and said: "Germany is threatened today on all her frontiers, and finds herself in such a position that she can only insure her future and face all her foes by seeking first of all to eliminate us from their number by concentrating, from the beginning, all her forces against us." Here he indicated how thoroughly in agreement he was with Lloyd George, who described Germany's position in similar terms in his speeches in 1908, and again in his interview in the London *Daily Chronicle,* January 1st, 1914. Furthermore, Colonel Boucher said: "To be in a position to resist attacks which menace her on all sides Germany is compelled to develop her military powers to the same degree," and he adds "it was to guard against the Russian danger that Germany made her (military) law of 1913." Then, with a candor not sufficiently appreciated by pacifists, he dealt with things as he saw them, and with ruthless military sagacity, he said: "Thus we see, when the time comes, and it may come soon, when Slavism desires to make an end of Germanism, the friendship of Russia can serve us if we are fully decided to fulfil all our duties towards her. Germany does doubt that France, remaining immutably attached to her treaties, would support her ally with all her strength, choosing, however, the most favorable moment for an intervention. If Russia attacks Germany, France becomes mistress of the situation. It will be sufficient for France to draw her sword at the opportune moment to make it impossible for Germany to defend the provinces she took from us." Colonel Boucher knew what was the real position of the military powers in Europe, and he knew the terms of their secret alliances. He said, "From whatever aspect Germany's position is studied it will be realized that her future is of the darkest, and that she has placed herself in the most perilous position. Now of all the factors which contribute towards compromising the destinies of this great Power, the chief factor is certainly the hostility of France." Colonel Boucher is, however, only one of many military authors who wrote in the same way. Lieutenant-Colonel Grouard, in his book, "The Ultimate War," published in 1913, said, "In no army has greater work been accomplished during the last thirty years than in the French army. Both as regards the improvement of our armament and in studying the best conditions for its usage, daily and incessant progress has been made in every branch of the military art."

What was the military strength of the Powers in 1913. The British Minister of War, Colonel Seely, in reply to a question, issued the following statement:

Russia.	
Additions made	75,000
Present Peace Establishment	1,284,000
Future: not ascertained.	
France.	
Additions proposed	183,000
Future Peace Establishment	741,572
Germany.	
Additions made	38,373
Additions proposed	136,000
Future Peace Establishment	821,964
Austro-Hungary.	
Additions made	58,505
Present Peace Establishment	473,643
Future: not ascertained.	

Referring to the strength of the British Expeditionary Force, Colonel Seely, in the House of Commons, March 10th, 1914, said: "We stand well for the purposes of immediate war on any basis which you may consider."

Is one guilty of "apologizing for Germany" when one records facts concerning the origin of the war? Is one guilty of "apologizing for Germany" when one examines the charges and allegations of war propagandists? It may be that some people believe all the evidence in the case was presented by the carefully selected bands of scribes and orators who made public opinion between August, 1914, and October, 1918, while censors and publicity department kept the field clear for them. If that be so, what then is to be said of Mr. Sidney B. Fay's contributions on the subject in "The American Historical Review," which completely invalidate the findings of the war propagandists? Is Mr. Fay guilty of "apologizing for Germany"? By what stretch of the imagination can it be conceived that Lord Fisher, Lord French, Lord Loreborn, Marshal Joffre, M. Georges Demartial, and numbers of other writers, in their several ways, are guilty of "apologizing for Germany"? And what is to be said of Colonel Repington, who, in 1911, told us that "the possibility of a war on two fronts is the nightmare of German strategists, and, considering the pace at which Russia has been building up her field armies since 1905, the nightmare is not likely to be soon conjured away." Was he, the "Military Correspondent" of the London *Times;* guilty of "apologizing for Germany" when he stated that fact? A glance at the first two chapters of Colonel Repington's book, "The Great World War," will be sufficient to convince anyone that he knew what he was writing about.

Our war-time prejudices seem to be a long time a-dying. Why? That is difficult to tell, for there have been published during the past two years any num-

ber of works on pre-war diplomacy and the military and naval preparation of the Powers—enough indeed to enlighten any intelligent citizen who desires to know the truth. There can be no excuse for any person lingering another hour in the foggy atmosphere created by the Gilbert Parkers, the James Becks, the Gilbert Murrays, the Andre Tardieus, the Dr. Dernburgs. These people were concerned only in putting the best face possible on the work of their governments; they were special pleaders, and wholly unfitted for the task of enlightening mankind as to the real causes of the war. The war itself, the conduct of it, is another matter, and no man of sense and understanding would attempt to justify what happened after the beginning of August, 1914, by anything that was done by statesmen and diplomatists before that date. Why, even Lloyd George himself has said: "The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries, of what happened before August 1, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly; and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it." Surely, no one would accuse Lloyd George of "apologizing for Germany," though his statement disposes effectively of the myth that the German Government was wholly responsible for the war.

It seems to me the matter of supreme importance for mankind is of far higher consideration than that of making out a case for any set of ministers or diplomatists; it is to go down deep into the workings of the European system and strive to find out what is wrong, that makes it possible for ministers and diplomatists to wreck a continent and destroy its youth.

FRANCIS NEILSON.

YOUTH, THE BUILDER.

Out of the way, War—stand aside!
It is I would pass, in my morning pride;
Pride of my youth, and my builder's skill
To shape a world to the deep world-will;
Pride of the sunny morning hour
That is mine alone. You have no power
To lay your stigma of dark death
Across my way. Your fearful breath
No longer shrivels the soul of me,
Terrified, cowering, afraid to see
What hides behind the tumult and blare
Of your noisy presence, your haughty stare.

We have stripped you, War (and your veils were three—
Romance, and Service, and Sanctity).
We have laid you bare to your molten deeps
Where hot gold smoulders in dripping heaps,
And the blood of blinded men washes in waves
Against the hideous, golden caves.

I, who am young, will heed you not,
Fiend of a time that is best forgot!
There is dawn ahead, and the light will shine
Alike on your work and on mine;
And my work shall be good in the sight of men,
For I go to build men's dreams again . . .

My work is waiting me over the hill,
And I pass you by—and I shall not kill.

The Young Democracy. —*Ruth Pearson.*

THE PULPIT

If the Sermon On the Mount Were Preached Today—

By Rev. V. T. Pomeroy, B.A.
Preached in the City Temple, London

"And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"—*Luke vi.*, 46.

TO HIM THAT WAS CRUCIFIED.

My spirit to yours, dear brother,
Do not mind because many sounding your name do not understand you.
I do not sound your name, but I understand you.
—*Walt Whitman.*

There are some people who believe that a great World Teacher is soon to appear. It is said that there are signs of his coming. Even in these days, when the earth quakes with man's insane violence and the sky is black with clouds of sorrow, there is a bright star which heralds the appearing of a religious teacher, to whose voice of wisdom all nations will give heed and who will invite men to follow him along a pathway of deliverance from folly and woe.

For myself it does not seem best to expect that a single person of wonderful presence will arise above all others to appeal to the minds of men and women the world over, although I do not deny the possibility. Certainly the world stands in tragic need of instruction; stands in need of a light which will lead men from the quicksands of death to the firm ground of life. It may be in the near future there will be many teachers in different parts of the earth, who, each in his own tongue and fashion, will tell the same commanding truths and liberate the thoughts already struggling for expression in a multitude of hearts. In any case, individual teachers will have only a short-lived power unless they can co-operate with an invisible but persuasive influence of Truth working in the depths of the world-mind.

But when I hear the announcement that mankind is being stirred by the expectancy of a Coming Teacher, I agree far more than I disagree. Are there not heralding signs? Is there not a strange knocking at the door of human thought? Have you not sometimes been thrilled by the hope, indeed the certainty, that we are on the eve of some great spiritual event, some tremendous entry of more divine reason and love into human affairs? In the minds of numberless people of different nations and classes there are at present smoldering convictions which would burst into flame at the breath of some sublimely brave and truthful utterance. I agree that there is a need of a World Teacher. I agree that in the thoughts of "plain people everywhere" there is something stirring which would leap up eagerly at the call of a new moral leadership. Only I think that, instead of the appearance of a single outstanding person, it may be that the expectation will be fulfilled in another way. I suggest that the Great Teacher will appear through a widespread recognition of the essential mind and spirit of him of old time, rather confusedly known to many as Christ, but for me preferably called by his own simple name—Jesus. I suggest that a great light will soon burst into the thinking and moral living of men because the true teaching of Jesus is about to be released from the dark misunderstanding which has enveloped it for centuries. I mean that we shall

very soon witness, and share in, if we will, an altogether new appreciation of and a profound moral response to the life-giving truth of God which was echoed on the hillsides of Galilee nineteen centuries ago by one of indescribable brightness of mind and soul—the Son of the Morning, whose voice was all too soon silenced by the cruel hostility of those who really knew not what they did. As one wide awake in a world of sleepers, he stood with radiant wisdom and enthralling love. Those who did but walk in their sleep blindly hurried him to death before he had filled half the measure of years which a man should have. But he had spoken, and he had displayed absolute loyalty. Since that far-off day fearful dreams have disturbed the sleep of mankind, and the shapes of those dreams have disguised and distorted the splendid truth which rang in men's ears. Some few have half awakened and have repeated vaguely some part of that message of light. Now, when the works of darkness are making more wide-flung horror, now when as never before men and women are beginning to admit that something is deeply and tragically wrong with the world of our human association, there are signs of a fresh awakening. The long misunderstood and rejected messenger, being dead, yet speaks. His message has preserved a marvelous vitality which will yet bear full fruit in the general mind of mankind. And I have a glad trust that the very spirit of that maltreated Son of the One Father will rejoice when on this earth there is a great opening of the eyes of men; a great cleansing of minds from ancient error; a setting free of hearts; a surging over all the miserable divisions, so that humanity will be uplifted to a new fellowship and equity and be carried forward with an accelerated and joyous speed along the course of its God-ordained destiny.

Before proceeding farther I must ask you to excuse the personal note while I clear up one point. The title of my subject looks like an impertinent insinuation. It seems to imply that I am clothed with superior wisdom and that I am casting contemptuous reproach upon everybody else who stands up to preach in so-called Christian countries. I am earnest in saying that such is not my condition and temper. I am only one in whose mind there faintly move thoughts of which others also are conscious. At best I am one whose courage and insight are poor—poorer far than belongs to many with whose spoken views mine conflict. But almost invariably we can only comprehend truth through the correction of an error. And I cannot imagine that now, any more than in Jerusalem 1900 years ago, it is possible to utter any fragment of the truth of which mankind stands most sorely in need without at the same time issuing a challenge to erroneous or defective understanding possessed by conventional minds and entrenched in existing institutions.

The civilized world being in the condition it is, we shall do well to grasp the simple fact that the biggest truth for the times will not be merely agreeable and consoling, but most provoking and disturbing. And we must accept the law which makes it certain that if one thing be true the opposite cannot also be true. The pity is that we often mistake for direct opposites what are partial opinions which ought to be reconciled in a larger view. The pity is that we so often have truth mingled with grievous error, or weighted with irrelevant matters so that it cannot beneficially operate in the individual lives and social affairs of mankind. This is what I am contending. In the case of what is called the Christian religion the essential has been confused with the unessential; the wisdom has been caged by folly; the will of God overlaid with the superstitions or vain speculations of men, as the mountain is obscured by wreathing mists. It is perfectly true that when I announce as a supposition "If the Sermon on the Mount were preached today," I am implying that it is *not*. To that implication I must adhere. I mean precisely that the Sermon on the Mount—understanding by this term the substance of the historic message of Jesus—is not preached. Some few men and women have preached and are preaching doctrines which get very near to it. I may declare something of my own best understanding of that body of saving truth. But preach the Sermon on the Mount *in its full force of principle and application* I most certainly do not. For if I did, it is doubtful whether any but a very few in churches would listen without protest. And if I continued in any Christian land to declare in their proper meaning and range the truths of that Sermon, I should probably before many sunsets find myself in prison or the madhouse, unless—unless that smoldering suspicion and hope in many hearts suddenly leaped to a flame, and in the heavenly glare of that fire the forces of error and iniquity slunk away and the forces of a radiant faith and fellowship sprang to command the common affairs of humanity. No one worth attending to will deny that in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus was laying down the rational principles and inner spirit which govern all wholesome human life in Society—the will of the Father for his children upon earth. Has Christian propaganda educated men and nations in those principles? Let me quote a weighty admission as answer to that question, if any answer is required beyond the appealing condition of Christendom at this hour. The late Dr. Washington Gladden shortly before his death wrote words which fall like hammer blows: "The outstanding fact is that there has been no clear and coherent teaching respecting the foundations of the social order from the Christian church. . . . The church has always been much more concerned to apologize for Jesus than to deliver his message. If, instead of arguing to prove his authority, it had obeyed his parting word and taught the things he had given it to teach the kingdom would have come ere now with power. . . . The one tragic fact of history is the lapse of the church from her vocation—the failure to grasp and enforce the central truth of the Kingdom of the Father which Jesus lived and died to reveal."

This verdict sounds grossly unfair; my own view seems a wild exaggeration, unless your eyes are opened to certain astounding features of the case. I have only time to confront you with one or two. Consider! If he who preached the Sermon on the Mount long ago and identified the purpose of his undying soul with the truth—if he appeared again among men and sought to repeat his message, what situation would face him? We will imagine him again to be a man, and to be of a color and class which would not by themselves bar him from good opportunity. Then, of course, we should naturally expect that he would, if nowhere else, make his voice heard in the church

which is commonly supposed to have proclaimed incessantly his very own gospel for these many hundred years. There at least he would be well received and understood. People would know beforehand what he had to say; but there would be a wonderful freshness and a personal interest, as when the composer himself consents to play a symphony which has been heard frequently before from the hands of those who only execute another's genius. I am not going to say that the Nazarene would receive a worse hearing among a company of church people than among those whose chief appreciation of Jesus is on the score that he called certain men hypocrites and thieves. I am not sure that the expectation of some people would be fulfilled—the expectation that Jesus today would be a fierce agitator, shouting scorn and hatred at rich folk, or even parsons, and turning for real sympathy to those in taverns.

But that is beside my point. What I ask you to reflect upon is the surprising fact that, if Jesus came to the church, which undoubtedly is united to the extent of calling him Lord, he would find himself by the very act of serving one section of the church falling under suspicion from the other sections, and probably excluded therefrom. Does anyone require proof? I will not enlarge on the definition of a real Christian as being one who hates Roman Catholics! Sufficient proof is nearer our own household. Why! I found recently that a member of my own church could not be transferred to the membership of another nominally progressive Noncomformist church because that member had not submitted to a particular form of a quaint oriental ceremony. The conclusion is irresistible. Jesus would hardly be called a Christian. Of course, as Trooper Peter Halket said, we are all Christians in the British Empire! But the strict ecclesiastical and theological tests of a Christian would certainly bar Jesus. All alike in rendering homage to his "Person," the churches have no common ground on which they could welcome his authentic personality; and sounding his name has been a substitution for genuine insight into the thoughts of his immortal mind. His own simple name, as it happens, is embedded in the name of one religious party in Christendom. The name is Jesuit. And when I consult an English dictionary, I find the meaning attached to Jesuit it is "cunning, crafty, and treacherous person." An achievement of nineteen centuries! The name of Jesus the proverbial badge of a cunning, crafty and treacherous person!

I think that in any and every church to which he gained admission the first thing Jesus would do would be to rise and say, "I wish to repeat a story. You have heard it many, many times before, but have missed its meaning. It is the story of a man who fell among thieves, and in his wounds and distress was neglected in turn by two passers-by, whose minds were too busily occupied with thoughts of the divine service in the church, but he was ministered to by a foreigner and heretic who saw the opening for divine service of a greater kind. And I tell you again that humane mercy is more to be desired than ceremonial sacrifice; and the theological sectarianism which excludes such as the Samaritan must also exclude me." Then some present would reply: "But it is written in the Epistles concerning the church and believers. . . ." And the old tone of sternness would sound again in a straight question: "Did I write the Epistles? Did I teach the church idea to divide men, or did I teach the idea of the Kingdom to unite them? Why have you allowed the former to be substituted for the latter?" That piercing question is pressing for an answer today.

I think that the Great Teacher would look upon the world of human lives outside the church and with a terrible compassion repeat his observation about the blind leading the blind. For a church divided by pursuit of artificial or secondary matters cannot stand with courage to expose the fundamental causes of human woe or with wisdom to educate men to obey "the unwritten laws of God that know not change." The conventional theological creeds of Christendom have divided men; the creed of Jesus is the promise of moral union. The theological creeds work out in the challenge: "Call him Lord, or I'll curse you"; the creed of Jesus works out in the invitation: "Seek first God's kingdom and justice that we may live together in love unshadowed by fear." And Jesus would look upon the world and see it torn with wasteful rivalries and destructive strife; see the barriers of bitter distrust between classes, the barriers of blood and flame between nations; see peoples under the heel of oppression and men and women everywhere afraid lest they or their children shall lack material sufficiency on the morrow. He would hear the misery of human hearts as the breaking of the sea on a long shore.

Then he would walk through the streets of the world and say what in substance he said before and died for saying it: "The people perish or live in dread because they are in bondage to false principles. Power which is treachery to the Kingship of God, plunder which is a denial of the providence of God, still combine to make this earth an offence to the heavens. And he who covets such power is as foolish as he who wields it; and he who has the spirit of plunder, even though he be poor, is as much condemned as he who has great possessions. And I say to you, as I said to them of old time who also suffered under imperial and economic blasphemies, your deliverance into abundant life can only come by a practical recognition of the Reign of God. 'Ye know how the rulers of the nations lord it over them and how their magnates oppress them. Let it not be so among you. On the contrary, whosoever would be great among you let him be your servant, and he that would be first among you let him be your slave.' Call no man master. Covet not the fruit of another's labor. Come! learn of me and understand the only path of peace."

Then I am afraid an ecclesiastical voice would protest that such counsel in its contemporary application was dangerous, because a general adherence to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount would soon make society tumble to pieces. And a political voice would give warning that the preacher was a disturber of the peace. I can only imagine that a calm irony would be in the retort, as it was in certain retorts nineteen hundred years ago. "Am I a disturber of peace? How then do you describe those who have guided, or permitted, mankind to slide to the slaughter of youth today? And is it staunch society which spreads upon the earth in these times, or is it society blasted by moral anarchy? Give heed to a parable. There was once a foolish man who built his house upon sand. . . ."

To some, the things I have said this morning will bring resentment simply because they are disturbing. But it is due time we all were profoundly disturbed

about the relative moral impotence of our religion in the vital issues of our common life. The fresh forces of health and salvation will only be released by a most troublesome stirring of our minds. I have done little more than pull down as a preparation for rebuilding. I have plowed so that seed can be sown. Some will blankly deny the truth of my contention. They will say that the Sermon on the Mount has been constantly sounding from the Christian pulpits of the world. It has sounded only as a sentimental love song to accompany the actual social atheism of our age-long human strife. I put it to you every one: If the Sermon on the Mount is preached today, why are none of the dominant powers of the world seriously embarrassed by us who dare to preach? Are these powers afraid of us? Do they care, really care, what we say to the people?

* * * *

A fine lady once said to Carlyle: "Oh! if our Lord came to earth again, how gladly we should welcome him to our homes and listen to his beautiful words." And through the thunder clouds of Carlyle's mind there came one of his lightning flashes of truth. He replied: "Madam, I have no doubt that if he came properly dressed and taught palatable doctrines, I should receive from you an invitation card: 'To meet our Saviour.' But if he came with his old time carelessness of repute and declaring his divine principles, you would be among the first to say: 'Away with him! let him be hanged at Newgate!'"

GEORGE NASMYTH

1881-1920

Brave, loyal, kind—the paths of joy he trod
And pain with equal faith, a soul apart,
A baffled dreamer radiant in his heart,
Or wounded saint, unvanquish'd, sent abroad
On errands high; a friend to those who plod
With sinking hope, who heard from moth to star,
Now loud and clear, now low and sweet and far,
The healing thunders of the living God!

War's enemy cut down while war survives
In the vast devastation of an age! . . .
Wherever generous dreams to Youth are given,
Or bleeding Love upon new faith revives,
He lives again! . . . where Truth's sword breaks a cage
Or white wings beat against a blackening heaven!

The Survey. —*Brent Dow Allinson.*

"AT" OR "THROUGH"?*

When primal Man, emerging from the Beast,
Began to shape his first rude Scheme of Things,
Stirred by his spirit's urgent questionings,
He built his House of Life towards the East,
And sought the Unknown God in dance and feast.
Then, wiser grown, he soars aloft on wings
Of sacrifice; new "windows" makes, and brings
His gifts to feed the altar-fire and priest.

New light—new "windows" to the House of Life—
New ages opened. Guard we, lest it be
A House of Many Windows—each bedight
With ornament and colour: each, too, rife
With window-cleaners, scouring lustily,
Who, gazing at the glass, see not the Light!

The Inquirer. —*C. H. Morgan.*

*Suggested by an article in the *Hibbert Journal.*

CONTRIBUTED

A Community Church and Freedom

[In White Plains, N. Y., is a Community Church dedicated to the love of truth and the service of mankind. It has for years maintained a free platform to which have been invited leaders of public thought on all important questions of the day. Recently this church encountered an expression of the mob spirit still all too prevalent in this country which broke out in opposition to the appearance of several speakers of radical tendencies. The American Legion, aided and abetted by a particularly intolerant local newspaper, organized the agitation, and for weeks held the church under a fire of abuse, misrepresentation and threats of violence. In defense of its position and in vindication of its ideals of political and religious liberty, which we once regarded as a common-place in the United States, the Board of Trustees of the White Plains Community Church issued the following Open Letter, written by its chairman.—J. H. H.]

Editor *The Reporter*:

The interest which you have shown in the religious basis of White Plains Community Church gives us an opportunity which we gladly accept, both on our own account and as a duty to our friends in the community, to make a full statement of what our church stands for:

I may be allowed to quote from the prospectus of the church as follows:

"White Plains Community Church is a fellowship of men and women who are striving to supply the essentials of an organized religious life. It is not a sect defending a creed; on the contrary, we welcome to our fellowship anyone, irrespective of creed, who recognizes the place of a spiritual force in human endeavor and who earnestly desires to co-operate in the effort to make this force a power in community living as well as in the personal life of the individual."

The purpose of the church as formally adopted declares:

"This church is based on the belief that religion is an essential element in human life and that it reaches beyond theology, sects and creeds. The purpose of the church is therefore to help its members widen and deepen their experience of religion, to uphold them in living according to their beliefs, and to unite them in efforts to increase in the community a recognition of the worth and dignity of human life."

The fact that the church has no specific creed beyond this statement of purpose is significant of its point of view. The church does not discourage belief; it endeavors to encourage each of its members in his own belief. There is only one thing that can save an organization that is on such a basis as ours from confusion and that is the truth. It must have access to the truth at all times, not only to the truth contained in the Bible and other books that record the truth as seen by the world's prophets, but the truth of science and contemporary contact with reality.

Practically then White Plains Community Church has a creed, a belief in the reality and power of the truth. A consciousness of the power and immanence of realities that are beneath the appearances of life is what is chiefly needed for the foundation of a church; creeds then fall into place as helpful but imperfect pictures of this reality, and the function of the church is to assist its members to make their conceptions of this reality more helpful and adequate. It must be evident that on this basis a real community church is a possibility, and only on this basis unless the community is unusually homogeneous. In our membership we have orthodox Christians, Unitarians, Jews and I know not what others, and we find it possible to unite all these in a helpful fellowship. We believe that this is worth doing, and further we believe that the church in general must move in this direction if

it is to be effective in a world that increasingly demands reality and spiritual efficiency.

Aside from the effects of religion upon the personal life of the individual, religion should most concern itself with the organization of life in communities and in larger units. We not only believe that this should be one of the chief outlets for religious feeling, but that a knowledge of the ways in which the world is improving is one of the chief sources of religious inspiration. Our speakers are men and women who are thinking and doing worth-while things in the life of the world. In inviting them to speak to us we hope that they will give us the spiritual aspects of those things that they have most at heart and unto which they have set their hands.

We desire that the church should be a source of spiritual power for better community living, and therefore we should feel that our enterprise was unprofitable if it did not result in community betterment in some tangible form. Our members as a matter of fact are actively concerned in many movements of local and state and national importance.

Now may I refer to the astonishing campaign against this church and some of its speakers that you and some of your readers have carried on intermittently during the last year. It occurs to me that some of your virulence may be due to a misconception of the temper in which we are approaching our problems and to ignorance of what kind of people we are. We are not socialists or conscientious objectors or Bolshevists or destructive in our tendencies. So far as I know there is neither a socialist nor a conscientious objector among our present members; I say this neither in pride nor in shame, but purely as a fact, to indicate that we are ordinary, normal people. We have, like other people, material and social interests that we are anxious to conserve; we have a wholesome amount of self-interest and selfishness. We have our homes in this community and our children are in its schools. We desire to leave a heritage of well-being to these children. We have no desire to upset the basis of society. In fact it is the very desire not to have society upset that has been the motive force in the activities that you deplore.

You and we apparently desire the same thing, namely, an orderly society in which life can have the greatest opportunity for self-realization. Our differences evidently come from some fundamentally opposite points of view. We both agree that the world is sick; we differ in the diagnosis and the treatment. You believe that the disease is local and that the infection can be removed by a surgical operation or by local applications; we believe that it is far more deep-seated, that a surgical operation would only get rid of the symptoms and would not touch the seat of the disease and its cause. The instrument that we propose to use both for diagnosis and treatment is the truth. We propose to learn the facts of the world and of human nature and of the maladjustments of life (which are largely mental), and we believe the truth itself will effect a cure. A belief in the efficacy of such a treatment flows from an entirely different conception of the world from that which expresses itself in a policy of repression. I should expect an advocate of repression to be also afraid of fresh air and sunshine. Instead of living in a world that is basically sound and wholesome, a world of freedom and democracy, he lives in a world that is evil and unsound and that must be kept under bonds and locks.

Not a day goes by that does not bear fresh witness in some field of human endeavor to the power and wholesomeness of the truth. Those who heard Dr. Salmon, on Sunday at our church, tell of the treatment of shell-shock among the soldiers, and similar mental diseases among civilians, could not have failed to be impressed with the fact that the entire therapeutic agency in this remarkably successful work is the truth, making the patient face facts instead of allowing him to avoid reality by an escape into the dim light and unwholesome atmosphere of illusion.

But you may say that the men and women that we get to speak to us on Sundays are not speaking the truth. Very well; let us say that they are right only half the time; but even fifty per cent of truth from a man or woman that is doing and thinking things that are worth while is worth having. And as to the untruth—we have no fear of that as long as it is in the open. We provide for the possibility of a discussion after the service in which the statements of the speaker can be subjected to examination if necessary. Untruth and error in the open evaporate because they are by nature unstable and unsubstantial. What we look for in our speakers is sincerity and an earnest purpose in thinking and doing worthy things. We do not expect necessarily to agree with them nor to approve of all they do and say.

No one can doubt that there is much in the present organization of society that will have to be modified. The world is developing so rapidly that perpetual changes must be made even to keep from slipping backward. The problem on which we can all unite is how to make these changes in such a sane but effective way that the world shall be saved from revolution. There is just one guide through this maze—the truth; it is the truth that shall set us free.

History shows that the surest way to bring on revolution is by repression, and that the surest way to avoid revolution is by the exercise of the right of free speech. The unhappy condition of Russia today is the direct and inevitable consequence of years of repression under the Czars and the Bolsheviki.

Now, Mr. Editor, in your opposition to the activities of our organization, I venture to say that you have done your full duty by the community in warning them not to attend our meetings. That is within your right. When you go beyond this point, however, and incite the community to deprive our speakers of their right to be heard, you are venturing on exceedingly dangerous ground. The right of free speech is sacred; it is guaranteed by the constitution. When you tamper with that right you have undertaken something more serious than a fight with our church; you have stepped into a larger arena. We have no right either to the credit or the distinction of being the defenders of the right of free speech, and I beg that you will not force us into accepting this too honorable position.

In what I have said I have tried to be judicial and fair. We have been very patient under your attacks and those of "A Citizen," "A Mother," "A Veteran," and our other anonymous critics. We shall be glad to unite with you in the development of community interests, and that ought to be possible, for it can scarcely be that we disagree as to the ultimate objects to be accomplished. We should prefer this and a more normal and slower development of our church

to a development under religious persecution. But whatever happens we shall stand unalterably upon our right to find the truth in the only way that it can be found, through freedom to hear all sides of every question.

For the Trustees of White Plains Community Church.

A. W. WHITNEY, *Chairman.*

White Plains, N. Y.

The American Commission's Report On Ireland

The American Commission on Conditions in Ireland, organized through the good offices of the editors of the New York *Nation,* has recently presented its report "on its inquiry to date on the situation in Ireland." This report of 144 pages, illustrated by the most awe-inspiring photographs which we have seen since the reports on the German invasion of Belgium, is the work of a special Commission chosen from the original committee of 150. This Commission consisted of L. Hollingsworth Wood, Chairman, Frederic C. Howe, Vice-Chairman, Jane Addams, James H. Maurer, Major Oliver P. Newman, Senator George W. Norris, Norman Thomas, and Senator David I. Walsh. It held fourteen public hearings, at which thirty-eight witnesses were examined, eighteen of whom were Irish, eighteen American, and two British. All of these witnesses had immediate contact with conditions in Ireland. In receiving testimony, and writing its report, the Commission keep always in mind "the strict obligations of sincerity and impartiality imposed upon it."

The conclusions reached by the Commission are listed as follows:

We find that the Irish people are deprived of the protection of British law, to which they would be entitled as subjects of the British King. They are likewise deprived of the moral protection granted by international law, to which they would be entitled as belligerents. They are at the mercy of Imperial British forces which, acting contrary both to all law and to all standards of human conduct, have instituted in Ireland a "terror" the evidence regarding which seems to prove that:

1. The Imperial British Government has created and introduced into Ireland a force of at least 78,000 men, many of them youthful and inexperienced, and some of them convicts; and has incited that force to unbridled violence.

2. The Imperial British forces in Ireland have indiscriminately killed innocent men, women and children; have discriminately assassinated persons suspected of being Republicans; have tortured and shot prisoners while in custody, adopting the subterfuges of "refusal to halt" and "attempting to escape"; and have attributed to alleged "Sinn Fein Extremists" the British assassination of prominent Irish Republicans.

3. House-burning and wanton destruction of villages and cities by Imperial British forces under Imperial British officers have been countenanced, and ordered by officials of the British Government; and elaborate provision by gasoline sprays and bombs has been made in a number of instances for systematic incendiarism as part of a plan of terrorism.

4. A campaign for the destruction of the means of existence of the Irish people has been conducted by the burning of factories, creameries, crops and farm implements and the shooting of farm animals. This campaign is carried on regardless of the political views of their owners, and results in widespread and acute suffering among women and children.

5. Acting under a series of proclamations issued by the competent military authorities of the Imperial British forces, hostages are carried by forces exposed to the fire of the Republican army; fines are levied upon towns and villages as punishment for alleged offenses of individuals; private property is destroyed in reprisals for acts with which the owners have no connection; and the civilian population is subjected to an inquisition upon the theory that individuals are in possession of information valuable to the military forces of Great Britain. These acts of the Imperial British forces are contrary to the laws of peace or war among modern civilized nations.

6. This "terror" has failed to reëstablish Imperial British civil government in Ireland. Throughout the greater part of Ireland British courts have ceased to function; local, county, and city governments refuse to recognize British authority; and British civil officials fulfill no function of service to the Irish people.

7. In spite of the British "terror" the majority of the Irish people having sanctioned by ballot the Irish Republic, give their allegiance to it; pay taxes to it; and respect the decisions of its courts and of its civil officials.

These conclusions are supported by a great array of evidence which is well described by *The World Tomorrow* as presenting "a picture almost unparalleled in modern times of the attempted subjection of a civilized people by assassination of elected officials and private citizens, by wholesale destruction of public and private property, by officially organized looting, robbery and acts of terror."

The Protestant members of the Commission unite in a supplementary report on the religious issue. Their conclusions constitute one of the most valuable portions of the document:

1. Outside of a part of Ulster, Catholics and Protestants live in peace and harmony and their political opinions are not primarily a matter of religion.

2. Even in Ulster religious bigotry is not by any means wholly spontaneous, but is artificially stirred up by those whose economic and political interests are served by dividing the people.

3. While it obviously lies beyond our province to pass final judgment upon the various aspects of the Ulster issue, we have not only a right but a duty as American Protestants to denounce the degradation of religion by such pogroms as occurred last summer. Upon this subject we owe it to our fellow religionists both in America and in Ulster, to speak plainly.

We recommend this report to our readers. It will not settle the Irish question, but it will do much to spread right ideas upon the subject. We have noticed that, in newspaper dispatches from England, the publication of this report is listed among the influences which are today moving the English government to the formulation of a new policy.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

NIGHT.

(A Blindman says . . .)

Darkness.
And yet—the world is splashed with gold,
The sky is blue—so I am told.
Em'rald green, the surging sea,
Yet what can this avail to me?

Despair?
Yes, of ever seeing light of day,
Or blossoming earth in fragrant May,
Hope forsaken?
No! For while I live—pray God it may be long—
I still can listen to the song
Of some small bird. I still can hear
The music of a waterfall. I do not fear.

Night.
Throughout the coming years I shall go on
In darkness. To my vision all is gone,
Yet though I be deprived of sight
I still can feel the sweet accord of nature
And in my darkness it will bring me Light!

EDWARD H. DEWEY.

SELECTED

Militarism and the Masses

[Wisdom and courage *after* the event are marvellous qualities. UNITY and many other papers were denied the use of the mails, and hundreds of men and women were imprisoned, for saying *at the time when it counted most* what is now said safely by the *Philadelphia Evening Ledger*. Still, it is never too late to tell the truth, if only the *Ledger* will say this when the next war comes.—THE EDITORS.]

Adventures of military aggression in the Old World are proving quite as futile and costly now as they have always been in the past.

Pessimists have been looking toward Japan and whispering of another great war. They saw a large army, untouched and strong; a formidable navy and great financial and material resources. They did not reckon with a new spirit of insurgency that hatred of modern warfare has created in the plain people of all countries.

The Japanese authorities drew down the veil of a heavy news censorship to conceal the confusion caused by the military ambitions of one of their controlling groups. They spent $400,000,000 in the Siberian advance, which was frankly intended as a movement of conquest in Russian territory. They lost hundreds of thousands of lives. Yet they have gained nothing tangible or sure.

A flare of revolutionary sentiment followed upon the partial collapse of the Siberian scheme. The masses in Japan had been feeling the cruel economic pressure which war always brings to the poor. They suffered additional discomfort because of an industrial and financial collapse caused by the failure of schemes of expansion engineered at enormous cost.

War has become a losing game for everybody simply because the conscience of the world rejects it. In its modern form it is a madness and a horror. Moreover, it is inefficient.

There are few men in Europe, great or small, who do not know this. The last five years fixed a conviction that has been growing throughout the world for a century. So the minds that lead nations have one overwhelming preoccupation. They are seeking a substitute for the great military force that once was necessary to protect government and hold civilization together.

Fear of war and a loathing of it underlie all the popular insurgent movements in the Europe of today. Mass opinion has outlawed the most ancient sport of kings.

That is natural enough. For war nowadays involves not only the armies in action, but the peaceful population behind the lines, the defenceless, the noncombatant and the innocent. There was a time when battles were fought on distant frontiers and when the nations concerned were permitted to live as if nothing strange were happening. But with modern weapons and methods of transport a battlefield will inevitably be as wide as the countries that engage in strife. No part of the population is immune. No part ever can be any more. Experts in the arts of annihilation are already talking of disease bombs and the manner in which typhoid, cholera and smallpox germs may do the work that TNT did in France—and do it more terribly.

There is no chivalry in modern battle. The best correspondents at the front in France could not reconcile themselves to the spectacle of exquisitely quartered staffs, rolling in luxury, 50 or 100 miles from the front and directing millions of cold and hungry men in a huge game of slaughter by factory methods.

It wasn't glorious, that spectacle. And is it fair to believe that any peoples — British, French, Italian or, on the other hand, Russian and Japanese — will ever again for any reason condone great wars, in which not only the armies but the whole general population are given up to slow obliteration and starved and impoverished meanwhile through demands made upon their energy and their resources to sustain the agencies and instrumentalities by which they themselves are tortured and destroyed?

Instinctive reactions in the minds of common men in all countries have imposed upon statesmen the task that now engages them. But a substitute for war is not easy to find. It never will be found if peoples do not consent to translate their convictions into constructive thought and systematic endeavor. The printed word ought properly to be the ultimate weapon in disputes between nations, since it is only by common understanding that international peace is possible.

War alone cannot stop war, though we were asked to believe that it could. The hope of the world lies in better general education. Man has progressed far enough on the road to knowledge to realize that those who tell him that he must settle his affairs by the methods of the jungle brute is a liar. What he needs now is to impress this conviction upon his governments. That he has begun to do through a silent and general rebellion against war.

It is not likely that Asia will ever be militaristic in the modern sense. Asia too can learn, as others must learn, by forgetting. The commercial-militaristic scheme of modern Japan, for example, is a frail creation built loosely above the enduring structure of older and nobler philosophies. Already it has put great oppression on the masses of the people. It cannot be dangerous unless that same oppression is carried to a point where it becomes intolerable to anyone who has been taught to read and think.

The British and the French have had all they want of great wars. It is idle to deny that the German masses have had all they want, whatever their scheming cliques may feel or desire. Upon what other foundations shall these people order their national lives? To what other agencies shall they trust for security and peace? Is it to be assumed that human intelligence cannot discover an answer to so simple and fundamental a question and suggest a method for which all mankind is waiting and groping blindly?

To a very great degree responsibility lies upon the plain man, who ordinarily permits prejudice and inherited delusions to befog his mind. He will have to give his aid and encouragement to those who are trying to find a way out of the confusion of international affairs. Especially in Europe he has learned to perceive meanness and ineptitude and rank futility under much of the gold lace of the warriors in whom he once put his trust. He must find another sort of man to follow. When humanity learns its lessons fully it will give no encouragement to the malevolent ignoramus who sneers at plans for world peace and decent international co-operation of a sort by which peoples now held apart may know each other and work together for a better order in the world.

The jingoes and the braggarts and the professional haters are not only fools. They are the ones who would again lead mankind into a blacker pit than that from which it has just struggled.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

COMMUNITY CHURCH CONFERENCE.

The first conference ever held in this country on the general subject of the Community Church Movement, was gathered in New York City on April 6th and 7th under the auspices of the Community Church of New York. It took the form of a two days' series of meetings, and gathered distinguished religious leaders and social experts from various parts of the country.

We print the complete program here as a matter of interest to our readers, and of important record.

PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6

10:00 A. M.—General Subject: "The Community Church and Religion."

(a) "Is a Community Church a Church?"
Joseph E. McAfee, author of "Religion and the New American Democracy," articles in *The New Republic*, etc.

(b) "The Principles and Aims of the Community Church."
John Herman Randall, Associate Minister of the Community Church of New York.

(c) "The Organization of the Community Church."
R. C. Stoll, Minister of the Amherst Community Church, Buffalo.

2:30 P. M.—General Subject: "The Community Church and the Community."

(a) "The Community Church and the Community Center."
Henry E. Jackson, Special Agent of U. S. Bureau of Education, author of "A Community Church."

(b) "The Community Church and Social Classes."
Dr. Arthur Whitney, Chairman of the Community Church of White Plains, N. Y.

(c) "The Community Church and Social Problems."
John Haynes Holmes, Minister of the Community Church of New York.

Open discussion in both sessions.

THURSDAY, APRIL 7

10:00 A. M.—General Subject: "Modern Community Problems."

(a) "Health."
Harvey Dee Brown, Associate Minister of the Community Church of New York.

(b) "Unemployment."
John B. Andrews, Secretary of Association for Labor Legislation.

(c) "Child Welfare."
Charles F. Powlison, General Secretary of National Child Welfare Association.

Open discussion.

2:30 P. M.—Informal Group Conferences, in charge of appointed leaders.

8:15 P. M.—Platform Meeting. General subject: "Religion Yesterday and Tomorrow."

Speakers: Percy Stickney Grant, Rector of the Church of the Ascension; Clarence R. Skinner, Minister of the Boston Community Church, Professor at Tufts Divinity School; R. C. Stoll.

John Haynes Holmes, Presiding.

CHICAGO CHURCH FEDERATION ENDORSES MOVEMENT FOR NAVAL HOLIDAY.

Resolutions passed this March 28 by the Chicago Church Federation at the regular meeting of its Board of Trustees:

RESOLVED, that in view of the information appearing in the public press regarding the willingness of Great Britain and Japan to confer with the United States on the question of a naval holiday, and the widespread interest in such naval holiday among the masses of people of the United States, Great Britain and Japan,

That the Chicago Church Federation hereby heartily endorses this movement and urges upon the Senate and the President the passage of appropriate legislation to bring about such a conference.

We especially commend the resolution submitted to the Senate by Senator Edge as follows:

"The President is authorized and requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to invite the Governments of Great Britain and Japan to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the duty of promptly entering into an understanding or agreement by which the naval building program of each of said Governments, to wit, the United States, Great Britain and Japan, shall be substantially reduced annually during the next five years to such an extent and upon such terms as may be agreed upon, which conclusion is to be reported to their respective governments for their approval."

We concur with the supporters of this resolution that it goes as far as is practicable at this time. We are opposed to the Walsh amendment calling in other nations as involving the naval holiday program in so many complications as to hinder and delay practical results.

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States and may be further published in any way thought best by the Commission on World Friendship of the Chicago Church Federation.

REV. HOWARD AGNEW JOHNSTON,
President Chicago Church Federation.

REV. WM. R. WEDDERSPOON,
Chairman Commission on World Friendship.

MRS. GEO. M. MATHES,
Vice-Chairman Commission on World Friendship.

A FRIENDLY WORD.

The writer has been piling up for several months the weekly copies of UNITY, a magazine founded by Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and continued since his death by John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. There is real difficulty in dealing with UNITY in an exchange column, for there is not a number which has not many columns that any Friend would wish to pass on to the readers of the *Intelligencer*. In general we may say of it that it is strongly for real Democracy and the faith in the ultimate goodness of men, which is the necessary foundation of Democracy; that it is strongly against all imperialisms whether of family, race or class; that it gives powerful expression to the demand for fair play and free speech everywhere; and that it is against wars, fightings and conflicts of hate for whatever purpose, and wherever found. All this is to say that it is a good paper to be had in any household, an ally and friend of the Society of Friends.

The reader is glad to miss in UNITY the sentimentality and sectarianism which mars much of the religious press. He finds the paper dealing with real problems on the basis of consistent application of the Christian principle to their solution. The editors and most of the correspondents believe that love among men will really solve the world riddles, and bring order into the world chaos. That means that they are willing to try it *and take the consequences.*

The Friends' Intelligencer.

THE WAYS OF THE GODS

By ALGERNON SIDNEY CRAPSEY

(International Press, 150 Lafayette Street, New York)

Is attracting wide and favorable notice. The New York *Herald* speaks of it as "an historical and sociological study vast in range and original in conception." The *Evening Post* says, "it is simply and intelligibly written." The Chicago *Herald-Examiner* calls it a "Flaming Book." The *Ethical News Notes* of Philadelphia speaks of each chapter as "a fascinating short story." The Cleveland *Plain Dealer* says "a place should be found for it on the family bookshelf." The Boston *Globe* remarks, "Written in simple English the book is in reality the romance of the Gods and apart from the information it provides it is an entrancing story."

"The Ways of the Gods" is passing to its second printing.

BAKER AND TAYLOR COMPANY

Trade Selling Agents

354 Fourth Avenue **New York**

Price $3.00. 400 pages with list of authorities and index. Bound in blue and silver gray. *To read it is an education.*

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- -

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago, Illinois

$3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription to UNITY, or 50 cents for a ten weeks' trial subscription to UNITY. Single copies, 10 cents.

Name .....City .....

Street .....State .....